

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,912	01/24/2002	Mustafa Akram	H 3933 PCT/US	7117
423	7590 12/02/2004		EXAMINER	
HENKEL CORPORATION THE TRIAD, SUITE 200		ELHILO, EISA B		
2200 RENAISSANCE BLVD.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GULPH MILLS, PA 19406			1751	_

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/937,912	AKRAM ET AL.	17
Examiner	Art Unit	
Eisa B Elhilo	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying t issues for appeal; and/or	he
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ıt
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: None.	
Claim(s) objected to: None.	
Claim(s) rejected: 14 and 16-32.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:	

Art Unit: 1751

established.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant has not presented any additional data or showing to overcome the rejection of record. The arguments dated 11/22/2004 merely rehash the arguments presented earlier, which were fully responded by the examiner in previous office action, dated July 23, 2004. Further, with respect to the argument that the combined references do not teach, disclose or suggest the combination of a cationic polymer and an anionic tenside, the examiner would like to point out that Hawkins et al. (US' 193) teaches a hair dyeing composition comprising cationic polymer (see col. 9, lines 50-67 and col. 10, lines 1-14) and anionic tensides (anionic surfactants) (see col. 7, line 9 and col. 14, Example 1). Therefore, the prima facie case of obviousness has been

Marguel Eusmann
MARGARET EINSMANN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
CROUP 1100